N4DBANAC	
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	
x	
STEVE ANACACY , Plaintiff,	
V.	22 Civ. 4239 (GHW)
DRC GROUP, INC., et al,	
Defendants.	
x	Telephone Conference
x	New York, N.Y. April 13, 2023
	2:00 p.m.
Before:	
HON. GREGORY H.	WOODS,
	District Judge
APPEARANCE	SS
EVIN-EPSTEIN & ASSOCIATES, P.C. Attorneys for Plaintiff BY: EUNON J. MIZRAHI	
AW OFFICES OF NO AN K EIN, P.A.	
AW OFFICES OF NO AN K EIN, P.A. Attorneys for Defendants	
AW OFFICES OF NO AN K EIN, P.A. Attorneys for Defendants	
AW OFFICES OF NO AN K EIN, P.A. Attorneys for Defendants	
AW OFFICES OF NO AN K EIN, P.A. Attorneys for Defendants	
AW OFFICES OF NO AN K EIN, P.A. Attorneys for Defendants	
AW OFFICES OF NO AN K EIN, P.A. Attorneys for Defendants	
AW OFFICES OF NO AN K EIN, P.A. Attorneys for Defendants	
AW OFFICES OF NO AN K EIN, P.A. Attorneys for Defendants	

THE COURT: et me begin by taking appearances from the parties. First, who's on the line for the plaintiff?

MR. MIZRAHI: This is Eunon Mizrahi for plaintiff.

THE COURT: Who's on the line for defendant?

MR. K EIN: Good afternoon, your Honor. Nolan Klein for the defendants.

THE COURT: Good. Thank you very much. What I'd like to do is to start with a few brief instructions about the rules I'd like the parties to follow during this conference.

At the outset, please remember that this is a public proceeding. As a result, any member of the public or press is welcome to dial in here. I'm not monitoring whether people are auditing the conference, so I just ask you to keep in mind that possibility. Second, please state your name each time that you speak. Third, please keep your lines on mute at all times except when you are speaking to me or to the representative of another party. Fourth, please abide by instructions from our court reporter that are designed to help her do her job. And finally, I'm ordering that there be no recording or rebroadcast of all or any portion of today's conference.

Counsel, with that out of the way, let's turn to the substance of today's proceeding. I scheduled this as both an initial pretrial conference and as a premotion conference. My agenda as a result is relatively straightforward. First, I'm going to give each of the parties the opportunity to describe

any legal or factual issues they'd like to bring to my attention.

I'm going to start with counsel for plaintiff, then
I'll turn to counsel for defendant. When I turn to counsel for
defendant, we can begin a conversation regarding the
anticipated motion to dismiss. Then we'll talk about next
steps in the case, and finally we'll discuss what, if anything,
I can and should do at this point to help the parties resolve
the case amicably. That's my agenda. et's start first with
counsel for plaintiff. What would you like to tell me about
the case as a whole.

MR. MIZRAHI: Good afternoon, Judge. Jason Mizrahi for the record. This is a fairly straightforward action under the Fair abor Standards Act and New York abor aw. As set forth fully in the parties' joint submission dated April 6, 2023, filed under docket number 48, the plaintiff was working as a warehouse employee at the defendant's recycling facility in the Bronx. Throughout the duration of his employment, he was consistently working approximately 56 hours a week in exchange for a straight hourly rate of \$11 per hour, regardless of how many hours he was working per week.

As such, we've alleged minimum wage and overtime claim under the Fair abor Standards Act and New York abor aw, and we've also alleged penalties in violations of the Wage Statute Protection Act for wage notice and wage statement violation.

The defendants in this case have articulated and anticipated motion for a partial dismissal isolated to the federal claims at issue here. And the parties currently have a mediation that they scheduled I believe in May.

The parties anticipate being able to globally resolve the claim at the mediation. As I mention in the beginning, fairly straightforward, fairly low value F SA, New York abor aw claim. Section five of the joint letter breaks down the categorical computation of plaintiff's damages. From plaintiff's perspective, this is a case that is suited appropriately for an early resolution. We also like to request a leave of Court to amend the complaint to allege additional allegations in response to the contemplated motion to dismiss.

And I think ultimately, although we expect the parties to engage in a productive mediation, a contemplated motion from our perspective would result in attorneys fees and costs.

Ultimately, it would contemplate the re-filing of the claim in New York state court. And this is a case where there have been substantive allegations of underpayment. All that being said,

I just want to reiterate the point that this is a fairly straightforward F SA, New York abor aw case.

Counsel for the parties has had a previous professional working relationship, and we've had other cases where we been able to resolve these kind of issues amicably. So we don't see this as any different from those prior cases.

	N4DBANAC
1	THE COURT: Thank you. You mentioned the possibility
2	of an amendment addressing anticipated motion. What facts are
3	you contemplating having here with the employed template within
4	the three-year statute of limitation period?
5	MR. MIZRAHI: Your Honor, my office has had multiple
6	conferences with the plaintiff from when we had initially filed
7	the complaint. Additional time is needed to confirm the
8	allegations regarding his work history and his employment
9	history, exactly when he started and when he stopped working
10	there. But beyond the allegations regarding his employment
11	history, we do intend to amend to include additional
12	allegations regarding some of the other claims that we've
13	alleged and some of the facts and circumstances surrounding his
14	employment at the defendant's recycling company.
15	THE COURT: Thank you. How would those address the
16	deficiency that the subject of the anticipated motion?
17	MR. MIZRAHI: Your Honor, it's just a fairly
18	straightforward analysis is whether he falls within the
19	three-year window or whether he doesn't. If we're going to be
20	including additional allegations regarding his employment
21	history, those would directly respond to the contemplated
22	motion, to the extent it seeks a dismissal for failure to state
23	a claim under the F SA.
24	Having not seen a full motion to dismiss, I don't know
25	whether defendant do intend to raise any additional issues that

- 1 | had not been previously articulated in their April 6 letter.
- 2 So we want to reserve the right to amend the complaint to the
- 3 extent defendants would be attacking any other issues or
- 4 discussing any other issues beyond the three-year window.

THE COURT: Thank you. et me hear from counsel for defendant. Counsel, what would you like to tell me about the

7 case as a whole?

MR. K EIN: Thank you, your Honor. This is Nolan
Klein for the defendant. I agree with Mr. Mizrahi. We've had
a number of cases in the past. We've always had a very
professional working relationship, and I don't think this one
will be any different. Obviously first and foremost the issue
that I raised and that I think -- I'm eager to hear what
amendment to the complaint would cure this issue. I don't
think I've heard that from Mr. Mizrahi today. But on the face
of the complaint, obviously it's timed-barred. I was actually
surprised reading through it because there's nowhere in the
complaint that mitigates or explains -- nor was there any time
period during which the plaintiff was working for these
defendants that was three years or less from the date of the
filing. So that's obviously a dispositive issue with respect
to the federal claim.

With respect to the substance of the claim,

Mr. Mizrahi alleges that the plaintiff was paid \$11 per hour.

I believe he arrived at that because it was a flat rate being

paid to the plaintiff. And if you divide out the alleged hours by the flat rate, it comes out to \$11 per hour. I've asked my client to get me the time and pay records to determine whether the number of hours alleged are accurate.

One thing that does jump out at me is that there's an allegation of nine hours per day, as well as an hour lunch break. I'm not sure. I'm not making that reputation right now, but I am still waiting for all those records from my client before we proffer any substantive defenses to the claim.

Obviously as pled it would be -- there would be New York abor aw issues. There's no federal law claim issue, but there would be New York issues. I'm waiting for that documentation.

But even without that documentation again, obviously there's a statute of limitations issue. And that dovetails with my request for a premotion conference if the Court would like me to just sort of dive straight into that.

THE COURT: Thank you. Yes, please go ahead.

MR. K EIN: Okay. So as I noted in my letter, your Honor, the complaint was filed on May 24th of 2022. It alleges on its face that plaintiff's last date of employment was January of 2019. The F SA has a statute of limitations of two years if there was no intentional misconduct, or three years if there was intentional disregard for the legal requirements of the F SA.

Even taking that three year date, which is the maximum

possible limitation period, that would take us to January 2022, four to five months prior to the date on which this complaint was filed. So because on the face of the complaint the statute of limitations has lapsed, the case law allows for us to motion to dismiss for failure to state a claim instead of asserting the statute of limitations as an affirmative defense and then moving for summary judgment. So as noted in my letter, I think that motion would be appropriate at this time.

THE COURT: Thank you. Good. So, counsel for plaintiff, anything that you'd like to say about the motion.

I'm happy to hear from you if there's anything else that you'd like to point out that you wasn't able to touch on during our conversation earlier.

MR. MIZRAHI: Just one thing, your Honor. This is

Jason Mizrahi for the record. Without having had the

opportunity to review this application in detail, I wanted to

mention that there may be some applicability of the executive

order issued by Governor Cuomo regarding suspension or tolling

legal deadlines during a period from March 20 to November 3,

2020. I think this was captured in Exec aw 29 -
THE COURT: I'm sorry, counsel, can I just pause you.

This is a statute of limitations issue about a federal statute

filed in federal court. Why does anything done by Governor

Cuomo effect the federal statute of limitations?

This is an

MR. MIZRAHI: I stand corrected, Judge.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- 1 issue that I just -- I understand that the Executive aw tolls
- 2 state limitation, the suspension of statute of limitations in
- 3 state statute. There's nothing further that we would like to
- 4 add, Judge. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you. I'm not aware that the F SA statute of limitations have borrows from the state statute.

That is the case for some federal causes of action, but I'm not aware that's the case for the F SA, but I look forward to seeing any arguments presented.

So counsel for defendant or plaintiff, I'll start with counsel for defendant. What's the status of Mr. Vaitzman? Are you representing him?

MR. K EIN: This is Nolan Klein, your Honor. No, I am not representing Mr. Vaitzman, only the defendants listed in my motion, the corporate defendant DRC Group Beverage Container Recycling, Gard Recycling and the individual Alex Doljansky.

THE COURT: Thank you. Fine. Understood. Very good. So let's talk about next steps. There's a motion to dismiss that's proposed that raises substantial issues regarding the viability of this case in this court.

Counsel for plaintiff, I understand you to be suggesting perhaps, but if not please let me know, that I let the parties focus on this mediation before the motion to dismiss is filed. I note that so long as this case is in this court and any settlement would involve a dismissal of F SA

claims, no matter how meritorious or un-meritorious, that yields *heeks* review by the Court, unless there's an offer of judgment or one of the other exceptions applies. So, counsel for plaintiff, what is your proposal here?

MR. MIZRAHI: Judge, I believe that it would be the parties — this is Jason Mizrahi for the record. I believe that it would be in the parties' interest and the Court's interest to allow the parties to exhaust possibilities of an alternative dispute resolution before commencing briefing on the pending motion as a contemplated motion to dismiss.

THE COURT: Thank you. Counsel for defendant, what's your thought?

MR. K EIN: Thank you, your Honor. This is Nolan Klein. I don't disagree, especially since we do have mediation coming up fairly soon. I think next week we have our initial conference with the mediator, and then Mr. Mizrahi said the mediation is set for May. I assume that's correct. I don't see it right now on my calendar, but I do know that they were working on scheduling it fairly promptly. I certainly see no harm in trying to mediate a resolution before we move forward with motion practice, so I wouldn't be opposed to that.

THE COURT: Thank you. Good. Understood. One moment.

(Pause)

THE COURT: Counsel, I just wanted to confer with

myself to think about the, I'll call it, economy issues here. As I say to the extent that the parties are working toward a resolution of the claims that involves the F SA, reaching a resolution that's going to involve a heeks review regardless of whether or not plaintiff's F SA claims have any merit, accepting for these purposes defendant's contention that they're clearly time-barred. So I need to evaluate the amount of effort involved to evaluate any motion to dismiss, also evaluating the heeks settlement submission, assuming the parties do not consent to the magistrate judge for purposes of evaluating a settlement or pursuing a judgment or otherwise.

I'm going to allow the parties to continue to use this court's resources and proceed with the mediation, notwithstanding the significant questions raised by counsel for defendant regarding whether this case was properly pleaded here in a non-frivolous way as a claim under the F SA. Substantial questions are raised as to whether or not that claim could have any merit as pleaded here.

But in the interest of at least economy for the parties, I believe that it is reasonable for me to permit you to go forward with your mediation under the auspices of the court and to plead the motion to dismiss afterwards. So what I'm going to do is this. I'm going to set a schedule for briefing the motion to dismiss.

As I understand it from the docket, counsel, your

mediation schedule is due by the 8th. Is that when the parties are planning to have your first session with the mediator or is it sooner?

MR. MIZRAHI: Jason Mizrahi for the record. Judge, I believe the parties have scheduled mediation for the 19th.

THE COURT: Good. Thank you.

MR. MIZRAHI: I'm so sorry, Judge. I just wanted to correct the record. We have a preliminary scheduling phone call with the mediator this month on April 19th. The parties have not yet scheduled the actual mediation, so we have a scheduling call on the 19th with the mediator, but we haven't scheduled the virtual mediation yet.

THE COURT: Good. Thank you very much. The motion to dismiss is going to be due no later than June 9. Any opposition will be due three weeks following the date of service of the motion. Any reply will be due no later than one week following the service of the opposition if any.

I find that there's good cause to stay discovery in this case pending briefing and resolution of the anticipated motion. A stay of discovery is not automatic in the face of a motion to dismiss as the parties know. However, Rule 26(c) provides the Court with broad discretion to stay discovery upon a finding of good cause. There are a number of considerations for the Court to take into account in determining whether or not good cause exist. First is the merit of the motion to

dismiss.

Second is the burden associated with the discovery that would be avoided; and third is the prejudice to any party opposing the stay. Considering all these factors here, I believe that there's good cause to stay discovery pending briefing and resolution of the anticipated motion.

Here defendants have presented a strong motion which, if successful, would resolve all the federal claims. And I see on the complaint no basis for an argument that diversity jurisdiction asserts here as exists here. So the first factor weighs heavily in favor of granting a stay because the motion as proposed seems to have a substantial merit. Of course I will not determine the outcome of the motion until I've reviewed the parties' submissions. But the statute of limitations F SA claims as counsel presumably knows is three years.

The second factor, which is the burden of discovery, also weighs in favor of the imposition of a stay. Here, this is a relatively straightforward F SA and New York abor aw case as counsel has described. As a result, I don't expect that the burden of discovery here will be very high, but still it is burdensome and will take time and money from the parties that might otherwise be invested in something else, particularly if the case is dismissed before this Court.

And finally, I don't believe that the stay will result

in undue prejudice to either party here. This is a relatively straightforward case. According to the complaint, the plaintiff's claims ripened over three years ago. Some additional incremental delay would not result in substantial additional prejudice, such that a stay would be inappropriate. End result, I'm going to stay discovery pending briefing and resolution of the motion.

Counsel, I'll enter an order with a briefing schedule. My hope is that that gives you enough time to focus on your efforts to mediate and resolve the case. If for some reason you have not been able to resolve the case by the time that the motion is due, you should feel free to write me and request an extension of the deadline for filing the motion. But my hope and expectation is given the nature of the case, the parties will be able to resolve it during the time between now and the time by which defendants' counsel would need to start working on what would be a relatively straightforward motion.

I think that that is it. I'm not going to talk about the case management plan and scheduling order. I understand that the parties already working toward a settlement. If there is a settlement, please notify me in accordance with my individual rules. Again, since the plaintiff has invoked this court's jurisdiction and has raised an F SA claim that triggers heeks review under heeks and its follow-on review.

So even in the event of a dismissal under 41(a)(1), I

	N4DBANAC
1	must still review the settlement unless there's an offer of
2	judgment or the parties consent to the magistrate judge or one
3	or the other possibilities is pursued. So please keep that in
4	mind. I will look forward to seeing your perspectives on that
5	if you reach a settlement. Otherwise, I look forward to seeing
6	the motion.
7	Anything else for us to take up here before we
8	adjourn? First counsel for the plaintiff.
9	MR. MIZRAHI: No, nothing else, Judge. Thank you for
10	your time.
11	THE COURT: Good. Thank you. Counsel for defendants?
12	MR. K EIN: This is Nolan Klein. No, nothing for
13	defendants. Thank you, your Honor.
14	THE COURT: Very good. Thank you all.
15	(Adjourned)
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
∠ 1	

25